

***California
Commission on Teacher Credentialing***

***Meeting of
November 7-8, 2001***

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 2

COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee

**TITLE: Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended
 Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation**

X Action

Information

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

**Goal 6: Provide leadership in exploring multiple, high quality routes to prepare
 professional educators for California's schools**

Prepared By: _____ Date: _____
 Betsy Kean, Ph.D.
 Consultant, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ Date: _____
 Margaret Olebe, Ph.D.
 Administrator, Professional Services Division

Approved By: _____ Date: _____
 Mary Vixie Sandy
 Director, Professional Services Division

Authorized By: _____ Date: _____
 Sam Swofford, Ed.D.
 Executive Director

Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Professional Services Division

October 15, 2001

Executive Summary

California's Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, which the Commission administers on behalf of the Governor's Office, includes a budget item of \$500,000 in 2000-2001 for the purpose of funding additional Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation in public and/or private colleges and universities. This agenda report provides background information about Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation; the funding history of Blended Program grants; the procedures used to solicit proposals for new planning grants for Blended Programs; the proposal review process, and a recommendation for five new planning grant awards for the development of Blended Programs to be funded under the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant.

Policy Issue to be Considered

Should the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award five new planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation?

Fiscal Impact Statement

The costs for funding the new planning grant awards for Blended Programs would be paid entirely from the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant funds.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission authorize the Executive Director to award planning grants for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation to the five institutions identified in the attached report.

Recommended Award of Grants to Develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation

Professional Services Division

October 17, 2001

Background

The Commission's 1998-99 budget included \$350,000 to provide grants to public colleges and universities seeking to develop blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. The list below indicates the institutions that received grant funding from the Commission during 1998-99:

- California State University, Dominguez Hills
- California State University, Long Beach
- California State University, Bakersfield
- Sonoma State University
- University of California, Davis
- California State University, Sacramento
- California State University, Stanislaus

As part of the Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement State Grant, additional funds were allocated for a grant process to expand this initial effort to develop Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. The guidelines for the Title II planning grant application process remained essentially the same as before, except that the application process was extended to both public and private institutions of higher education. Below are the guidelines relating to the issuance of grants to postsecondary institutions to develop programs that blend subject matter and professional preparation programs for prospective teachers:

1. Funds granted to institutions through this program must be used to support the development of blended programs of undergraduate teacher preparation. Only institutions with approved subject matter and accredited teacher education programs may participate in this program.
2. Grants should be used to support faculty release time to develop programs that meet the Commission's Standards. Participating institutions will have up to twelve months from the award of the grant to submit a proposed program to the Committee on Accreditation for initial accreditation.
3. Institutions should use funds granted under this program to blend professional preparation programs with either existing liberal studies programs for multiple subject credential candidates, or existing single subject programs for single subject credential candidates.

4. Campuses may apply for up to \$50,000 under this program to cover the costs of release time for faculty from Colleges/Schools of Arts and Sciences and Colleges/Schools of Education to collaborate in the development of a program that meets the Commission's Standards.
5. Institutions that previously received funding from the Commission to develop a Blended Program are not eligible to apply for funding under the Title II grant process, even for a different credential area.

Grants Funded under Title II, 2000:

An RFP under Title II was issued on February 5, 2000 for public and private institutions with teacher preparation programs interested in planning a Blended Program of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation. A review panel comprised of experts in the field from colleges and universities as well as several Commission staff met initially to review these proposals on April 6, 2000. Readers participated in a training process that included a review of the RFP, a review of the proposal evaluation criteria, and several calibration exercises applying the criteria in common to proposal samples. Readers were paired off and assigned three proposals each to read and score over the course of the next week. Recommendations were subsequently made to the Commission and approved to fund proposals from the eleven institutions listed below:

- St. Mary's College (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD)
- San Diego State University (Multiple Subject, BCLAD)
- California Polytechnic State University, Pomona (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Northridge (Single Subject, English; Single Subject, Mathematics)
- Dominican College (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- San Jose State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Los Angeles (Single Subject, Science)
- Humboldt State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, San Bernardino (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- Stanford University (Single Subject, English)
- University of California, Riverside (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD)

Table 1 beginning on the next page provides the scoring criteria the readers applied to each grant application.

Table 1
Proposal Evaluation Criteria

| Proposal Evaluation Criteria | Maximum Score: Each Criterion |
|--|-------------------------------|
| (1) <u>Credential Type(s) and Number of Participants.</u> The proposal provides a strong rationale for offering particular credential type(s) in the program. The plan targets school subject(s) and credential specialty(ies) in which teacher shortages occur in local area schools (K-12). The proposal provides a credible basis for anticipating comparatively large numbers of enrolled students during the first three years of the program's availability. | 3 Points |
| (2) <u>Support and Articulation.</u> The proposal offers a credible prospect that candidates will be supported and retained as they move through the program. Articulation agreements with local community colleges are a credible part of the plan to provide a potentially seamless preparation program for transfer candidates. | 7 Points |
| (3) <u>School Placements.</u> Candidates are likely to be placed with teachers who will provide relatively strong models for candidates, in schools with comparatively high need for qualified teachers, including (but not limited to) schools with teacher shortages. | 5 Points |
| (4) <u>Subjects of Anticipated Blending.</u> Within each credential type to be offered to candidates in the program, the proposal offers a credible prospect that subject matter and professional preparation will be blended in multiple significant subject areas that have been selected by the institution. | 8 Points |
| (5) <u>Institutional Readiness for a Blended Program.</u> The proposal provides strong evidence that the requested grant would yield relatively significant "gains" in terms of the institution's capacity to plan, develop and offer a program that will meet all of the <i>Interim Standards for Blended Programs</i> . | 10 Points |
| (6) <u>Program Planning Leadership and Participation.</u> Leadership roles as well as planning and development duties would be assigned to individuals who are well-qualified for the roles/duties. | 9 Points |

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| (7) <u>Program Planning Organizational Chart</u> . The plan for program development is clear and well-organized with sound responsibilities and clear lines of accountability. | 10 Points |
| (8) <u>Intramural Collaboration</u> . The plan for intramural collaboration is sound, and includes appropriate roles and responsibilities for each intramural participant. | 10 Points |
| (9) <u>Extramural Collaboration</u> . The plan for extramural collaboration with K-12 practitioners and community college representatives is sound, and will draw on the expertise of personnel in the schools/colleges most affected by the program. | 10 Points |
| (10) <u>Institutional Commitment</u> . The proposal includes credible evidence of comparatively broad and high levels of administrative, fiscal and faculty support and commitment by the participating intramural units and extramural partners. | 10 Points |
| (11) <u>Program Planning Timeframe</u> . The proposal includes a credible timeframe that promises to yield a strong program plan that will be submitted on or before March 1, 2001 for accreditation on the basis of the nine <i>Interim Standards</i> . | 8 Points |
| (12) <u>Program Planning Budget</u> . The proposal includes a complete budget. The sponsors would add to the effectiveness of the Commission's grant with appropriate contributions from local (institutional) resources and other (federal, private, etc.) sources. | 10 Points |
| Total Possible Score for a Grant Award Proposal | 100 Points |

RFP Process for 2001

In February, 2001, an RFP was sent to the field inviting applications for a Blended Program planning grant. The same directions and criteria were used as during the Year 2000 grant process, except for permitting institutions that had previously received a planning grant to reapply in order to establish a Blended Program in a new subject area or credential program. A

total of four Blended Program grant applications were received. An expert panel was assembled at the Commission's offices on April 17, 2001, to read and review the grant applications, using the process and criteria described above.

The following institutions were recommended by the panel to receive Blended Program planning grants, and the Commission approved those grants at its May, 2001 meeting:

- California State University, Chico (Single Subject, Physical Education)
- California Lutheran University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)
- California State University, Monterey Bay (Multiple Subject, B/CLAD; Education Specialist)
- San Francisco State University (Multiple Subject, CLAD)

Because additional Title 2 funds were available for Blended Program planning grants, another competition was held during Fall, 2001. An RFP was sent to the field in June, and a total of eight grant applications were received. Three of those applications were judged to be ineligible because they sought funds to revise existing Blended Programs rather than to plan for new programs. An expert panel was assembled on October 15, 2001 to read and review the eligible applications, using the process and criteria described above. The following institutions are recommended by the panel to receive Blended Program planning grants:

- California State University Los Angeles (Single Subject, Art; Single Subject, Music)
- Concordia University (Multiple Subject)
- Mount St. Mary's College (Multiple Subject, CLAD/BCLAD)
- University of California, Riverside (Single Subject, Mathematics)
- California Polytechnic State University San Luis Obispo (Education Specialist)

Transition to the Recently Adopted Blended Program Standards

Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Blended Programs of Undergraduate Teacher Preparation were adopted by the Commission on October 4, 2001, replacing the Interim Standards that had been in effect since August, 1998.

The new Blended Program Standards will be appended to the newly adopted standards for Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs. They are being kept as a distinct set, and focus only on attributes not addressed in the Elementary Subject Matter Preparation and the Professional Teacher Preparation Program Standards. Meeting these standards is required for institutions seeking accreditation of Blended Programs. All Blended Programs must also have approved programs of Elementary Subject Matter and Professional Teacher Preparation.

Institutions that have received planning grants in response to the RFPs described above have committed to writing responses to the Interim Standards, as those were the Blended Program Standards in effect when the RFPs were issued. They will also have the option of writing instead to the revised standards and will be encouraged to do so.

Blended Programs that link Elementary Subject Matter and Professional Teacher Preparation Programs will be required to transition to all of the revised standards by January, 2004, the transition time adopted by the Commission for those programs. Blended Programs linking Professional Teacher Preparation Programs with subject matter preparation programs that do not yet have revised standards, e.g., Single Subject Mathematics Programs, will be allowed to transition as those new standards are adopted or when their institution enters their next accreditation cycle.